**SOUTH WEST MAT IMPROVEMENT CAPACITY FRAMEWORK**

This tool has been designed to help Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) understand their current capacity to *support and drive* school improvement – so that they can build and strengthen their current capacity and potentially to grow their capacity to support more schools.

It uses a framework which breaks down MAT improvement capacity into 12 elements, under five main headings. These are based on research about what works in MATs and similar networks of schools internationally. The framework does not assume that there is one best way to support and drive school improvement as a MAT; instead, it isolates the questions, issues and practices that should help enable all kinds of MAT to become more effective in supporting their schools to improve.

The MAT improvement capacity framework:

**How to use this tool**

For each of the 12 elements of improvement capacity, the rubric includes guiding questions to consider, as well as descriptors of what strong and weak improvement capacity would look like in a MAT.

Use the questions and descriptors to rate your MAT against each element along a four-point scale:

**Red (weak capacity) Amber Red Amber Green Green (strong capacity)**

Descriptors have deliberately not been provided for the “Amber Red” and “Amber Green” ratings. If you think that your MAT matches neither the “Red” nor the “Green” descriptor, think about which end of the scale it is closer to, and choose the appropriate rating. The right-hand column of the rubric has space for you to mark your rating and make some brief notes about your rationale for choosing that rating.

Remember: this tool is diagnostic, not evaluative or judgemental. The aim is to identify your MAT’s most significant areas of strength and challenge, so that you can build your capacity for improvement. A “Green” rating does not mean that an element is currently perfect, just that it is an area of strength upon which to build. Likewise, a “Red” rating does not imply failure or underperformance, it simply highlights an area where capacity building should be a priority.

| **Element** | **Questions to consider** | **Red (weak) looks like…** | **Green (strong) looks like…** | **Current rating and key evidence** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Vision, culture and ethos** |
| **1A. Clarity of purpose**Vision for the MATLink to strategyRoles and responsibilities | 1. **Does the MAT have a clear vision** of what excellent education (in terms of its approach to the curriculum and teaching and learning) looks like in practice?
2. **Does the MAT know *how* it will improve the schools** in its trust to deliver its shared vision for excellent education?
3. Can the MAT articulate and explain **how its strategy for improvement connects to its vision** for excellent education?
4. Has the MAT clearly articulated **the distinctive roles of the MAT, clusters and individual schools** in driving continued school improvement?
5. Are these different roles reflected in the MAT’s allocation of **accountabilities in its scheme of delegation?**
6. **Do directors, trustees and staff share the vision and approach** and does it inform and drive decision making at all levels across the MAT?
 | 1. The MAT has not yet fully developed and refined its vision for the quality of education such that it is insufficiently precise
2. School improvement initiatives are often reactive and/or incoherent and consequently have limited systematic impact
3. There is no shared language of improvement across the MAT and schools can’t see how the improvement strategy connects to the overall vision for education
4. There is limited clarity across the MAT about the roles of key players in driving school improvement
5. The scheme of delegation does not answer vital questions about who is accountable for what in school improvement
6. Leaders pay - at best - lip service to the vision; key decisions are reactive and ad-hoc, or mainly viewed through the lens of an individual school
 | 1. The MAT has a clear and compelling vision for the quality of education it expects to deliver in all of its schools
2. There is a clear and shared articulation of *how* schools across the MAT will be supported to improve, and this approach is followed through systematically across the MAT
3. The MAT is able to exemplify how its vision for educational excellence can be achieved through an aligned language and practical examples of best practice which form the basis of MAT wide expectations
4. The distinctive roles of all those responsible for driving school improvement have been clearly defined, both in terms of what individuals actually do, and how they relate to one another and are kept under review
5. Roles in school improvement are reflected in the scheme of delegation, and are well understood across the MAT
6. Everybody in the MAT is aligned around the educational vision and can describe what it looks like in practice. Fidelity to the vision drives all key decisions across the MAT and within individual schools
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **1B. Understanding of needs**Pupil/School NeedsLink to MAT prioritiesApproach to school improvement for different schools | 1. Does the MAT have a clear **understanding of the** **full spectrum of needs of pupils in its schools** (i.e. SEND, pupil premium, low and high prior attainment and EAL pupils)?
2. Does this understanding of needs and performance **link to priorities for improvement** across the MAT as a whole?
3. Is the MAT’s understanding of the **improvement priorities of different schools** within the MAT informed by a strong understanding of the data and evidence?
4. Does the MAT know how to **differentiate its approach to school improvement** for schools at different stages in their improvement journey?
5. Does the MAT have clear **systems and processes to diagnose the needs of new joiners** and ensure they quickly get the support they need?
6. **Are weaker schools in the Trust prioritised** for support and how far is this owned across the Trust?
7. Does the MAT understand how to provide **support and challenge to stronger and outstanding schools?**
 | 1. Leaders’ understanding of the differing needs of pupils is superficial; decisions are too often reliant upon assumption/guesswork
2. MAT leaders’ priorities for improvement are unclear or too numerous to be manageable and/or do not address the needs of specific groups of pupils or schools within the MAT
3. The MAT’s approach to school improvement is not sufficiently refined – or data-informed – to respond to evidence of pupil and school needs
4. The MAT’s approach to improvement is inflexible and doesn’t take account of new evidence or the improvement journey’s in individual schools
5. The MAT doesn’t have systems to quickly diagnose the needs of new joiners and develop a bespoke plan for support and intervention to meet their needs
6. The MAT’s capacity and/or expertise to support weaker schools is insufficient to ensure that they receive the resources and support they require to make rapid improvements
7. School improvement is only considered in relation to weaker schools; stronger schools do not receive support and challenge to further improve
 | 1. MAT and school leaders go beyond headline data to understand variations and trends in performance between groups of pupils within/between schools, phases and geographies
2. MAT leaders have developed a manageable set of priorities for improvement to meet the specific needs of their schools, pupils and communities
3. MAT leaders have a deep understanding of the performance of different groups of pupils across its schools and a differentiated approach to meeting the needs of all pupils and schools
4. MAT leaders can point to ways in which they have adapted their approach to meet the needs of schools at different stages of improvement
5. The MAT quickly diagnoses the needs of new joiners and provides any support needed
6. There is a strong sense of collective responsibility. Leaders and staff are committed to supporting weaker schools to improve
7. Stronger schools are constantly supported and challenged to improve by MAT leaders, and by internal and external peers
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **1C. Leading a culture of improvement** Aspirations for pupilsNon-negotiables vs autonomy for schoolsStaff engagementInnovation | 1. Is the MAT systematic in how it fosters **high aspirations and expectations for pupils** in all its schools?
2. Is the MAT clear about what it regards as the **non-negotiables for school improvement and where schools have autonomy** to decide for themselves?
3. Is the leadership structure of the MAT clear about **responsibility for school improvement with clear accountabilities** for impact?
4. **Do** **staff across the MAT feel like they have been genuinely engaged** in co-constructing the approach to improvement? Are they committed to working across the MAT to support all of its schools?
5. Is the MAT’s approach to **developing consistency and respecting the identity** and context of individual schools reviewed and adjusted on the basis of evidence?
6. Does the MAT have a culture and system for **encouraging, assessing and scaling up innovation** and the identification and dissemination of best practice?
 | 1. Aspirations and expectations are insufficiently ambitious and inconsistent across schools within the MAT
2. There is confusion and inconsistency over what are MAT-wide expectations and what schools are able to decide for themselves
3. It is unclear how responsibility for school improvement is structured across the Trust or how it relates to the leadership of teaching and learning within individual schools
4. Staff feel that they have not been involved in developing, and are not motivated by, the approach to improvement which has consequences for levels of engagement with the MAT and willingness to support others
5. There is unhelpful rigidity in some aspects of the relationship between the MAT and their schools, coupled with too much fluidity in other areas
6. The MAT cannot articulate its approach to best practice. As a result there is no systematic process for taking successful innovations to scale
 | 1. Aspirations and expectations for all pupils are universally ambitious in all MAT schools and this is systematically reinforced by MAT leaders
2. The MAT has a clear rationale for what decisions and activities it expects to happen at MAT level, cluster (or region) level and school level. The degree of autonomy afforded to schools and how this varies by the performance of schools is well understood
3. The relationship between the leadership and accountability for school improvement at school and MAT level is clear and well understood by all
4. Staff are highly motivated and engaged in the work of the MAT. They have real influence over the approach taken by the MAT to improvement and are willing to support others
5. The balance between autonomy and consistency is reviewed and adjusted in light of evidence and feedback from school leaders within the MAT
6. The MAT has a clearly articulated approach to best practice. Evidence-based innovation thrives. There are clear processes for realising the benefits of successful innovation across the MAT
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **2. People and partners** |
| **2A. Building capacity for improvement** Capacity for school improvementUsing the MAT’s best leaders and teachersExternal partners | 1. Does the MAT have a clear strategy which sets out **how it will structure and locate capacity for school improvement** both in its current state and to meet the demands of any anticipated growth?
2. Does the MAT have a clear **system for identifying who are its best leaders and teaching staff** and which schools have strength in specific phases or subjects?
3. **Are system leaders and lead practitioners being used strategically** to support other schools, model good practice and coach their peers across the MAT?
4. Does the MAT know where its areas of weakness are, in terms of curriculum and teaching and learning performance and **does it bring in external expertise where necessary?**
5. Does the MAT make use of an intentional and **prioritised set of partnerships and networks?**
6. Does the MAT assess **which partnerships and networks make the greatest impact** in terms of improvement?
 | 1. The MAT lacks the structures, expertise or capacity to deploy teaching and learning support effectively across its schools in response to identified needs
2. Where pockets of expertise exist, it is often in isolation and not widely known; as a result schools look externally before looking to internal colleagues
3. The MAT hasn’t yet developed mechanisms to use its most effective leaders/practitioners to support and develop other staff and schools across the MAT
4. The MAT is resistant to using outside expertise to help it address weaknesses or over-reliant on poorly chosen external providers with little sense of whether it is addressing the greatest needs of the MAT
5. Limited systematic use is made of hubs of recognised expertise such as teaching schools, National Leaders of Education (NLEs), and lead teachers.
6. The MATs approach to and engagement with partnerships and networks is incoherent with relationships prioritised for tenuous or historical reasons
 | 1. MAT leaders organise the teaching and learning support between schools, clusters and the centre based on a clear, evidence-informed theory of action and evidence of impact
2. MAT leaders have a strong understanding of where specific expertise exists across the MAT and how it can be used to support other schools
3. The MAT adopts carefully considered approaches to using system leaders and lead practitioners and promotes knowledge transfer through coaching, modelling and enquiry led learning
4. MAT leaders are confident in deciding when (and when not) to use external expertise, support or materials; they are clear about where weaknesses lie and are open to learning from and with others
5. Recognised hubs of expertise such as Teaching Schools, National Leaders of Education (NLEs), or lead teachers play an integral part in supporting the improvement of schools
6. MAT leaders can point to the most important partnerships and networks and can articulate the purpose and impact of these partnerships
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **2B. Recruiting, developing and retaining talent**Recruiting to the MATStaff Progression Talent Management | 1. Does the MAT have a **clear approach to recruiting staff at all levels** - teaching assistant, teachers and leaders? Do staff seek to join the MAT or do they see employment as largely defined in the context of an individual school?
2. Does the MAT have a well-developed **strategy for developing teaching staff throughout their careers** from ITT to expert? Do all staff understand what this roadmap for progression looks like?
3. Are staff clear about the ways they can **gain professional autonomy and promotion**?
4. Does the MAT have a **common model for appraising staff** and identifying priorities for development and improvement?
5. Is there a **succession planning and talent management strategy** across the MAT, supported by formal development programmes?
 | 1. Staff recruitment and development is delegated to schools; there is no co-ordinated approach across the MAT; staff decide whether to join based on the school rather than being part of the wider MAT
2. Teaching staff and leaders are not able to benchmark their current performance against clear expectations; which restricts the MATs ability to support promotion and development opportunities
3. Autonomy and promotion are not used strategically in order to grow/retain talented teachers and leaders
4. There is no common model for appraisal; appraisals are left to individual schools to manage on their own and do not focus on development and improvement of staff across the MAT
5. There is no systematic approach to developing talent across the MAT; staff have to find their own opportunities to develop and may choose to leave the MAT to find new opportunities for promotion and development as a result
 | 1. The MAT has a clear approach to recruiting and developing the best staff in line with its vision; teachers and leaders are attracted to join a school because it is part of the MAT
2. The MAT provides consistent expectations for the standards teachers are required to meet progressively from NQT year onwards; there is a clear development pathway for all staff, which might include managed placements across the MAT
3. Deployment and promotion practices across the MAT give staff who demonstrate their effectiveness autonomy and opportunities to lead
4. A shared model for appraisal helps school and MAT leaders make informed choices on deployment and development; appraisal conversations help staff grow as professionals
5. The MAT is implementing a clear talent management strategy to place staff where they are most needed; aspiring middle and senior leaders are deployed strategically and supported by formal development programmes
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **3. Teaching and learning** |
| **3A. Approach to Pedagogy** Pedagogical principlesSharing practice across the MATEvaluation/evidence  | 1. Are the **principles which underpin the MAT’s approach** to teaching and learning visible and understood by all?
2. Is there a shared understanding and conversation across the MAT about **what great teaching and learning looks** like based on research and evidence?
3. Does the MAT provide **regular opportunities to share and learn** from outstanding practice?
4. **Does the MAT designate phase/ subject experts** who are responsible for deepening subject knowledge and developing the curriculum and schemes of work?
5. Does the MAT have **clear expectations and systems for a well-ordered learning environment** and addressing the needs of pupils with behaviour issues?
6. Is there a coherent approach to evaluating the **impact of specific pedagogies and interventions** within the MAT?
7. How effectively do **MAT leaders use evidence** in their leadership of teaching?
 | 1. The MAT has not yet developed or defined the core principles which will underpin its approach to teaching and learning
2. There is wide variation in the pedagogical approaches employed across individual schools which make it difficult to embed a shared language of learning or provide informed leadership of teaching and learning across the MAT
3. There are little/no opportunities for teaching staff to see great teaching in practice
4. Collective subject leadership across the MAT is underdeveloped. Where phase/subject experts have been designated their role is unclear and not adding value to schools
5. Behaviour management and the learning environment is left to individual schools to manage with mixed and varied results
6. Individual approaches to the development of teaching and learning are isolated within individual schools, limiting opportunities for MAT wide development or improvement
7. New approaches to teaching and learning are adopted without a clear rationale and strong evidence that they will be an improvement on existing practice
 | 1. The MAT’s approach to teaching and learning is underpinned by core principles informed by a wide evidence base of proven practice
2. The MAT’s principles of learning provide a common language which facilitates conversations about teaching and learning across the MAT
3. There are regular opportunities for teaching staff to see and learn from really great practice
4. Phase and subject expertise across the MAT plays a vital role in developing excellent subject and phase pedagogy
5. MAT leaders set clear expectations for the learning environment. Schools are able to access strong systems for behavioural support when needed leading to high standards across the MAT
6. Fresh approaches are introduced in a carefully managed way and forensically evaluated before being rolled out across the MAT
7. The MAT is involved in developing and learning about what works, uses evidence intelligently, and changes practice based on their own in-school evaluations and external research
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **3B. Leadership of teaching**Role/impact of school and middle leadersSkills of leaders of teaching and learningOther support for improving teaching | 1. Does the MAT enable leaders of teaching and learning to have **time to consider their impact on improving learning** across the MAT?
2. Are school/middle leaders **supported and empowered as leaders of teaching** and learning? Are they equipped to help teachers adopt highly effective techniques in the classroom?
3. Does the MAT invest in developing the **skills and capacity of leaders** to lead and facilitate teacher training and development?
4. How does the MAT invest in both the **design and delivery of high quality programmes and support** to improve teaching and teachers?
 | 1. The MAT does not prioritise the leadership of teaching and learning, delegating it entirely to individual schools
2. The role of middle leaders as leaders of teaching and learning is underdeveloped. Too frequently, middle leaders are managers of staff and systems, but are not expected/supported to help teachers grow as professionals
3. Leaders lack the confidence or expertise to identify effective teaching practice and/or provide support and are not supported to develop these skills
4. The MAT has not developed a menu of effective approaches or programmes to systematically improve the quality of teaching and learning
 | 1. Leadership of teaching and learning is prioritised as the most important improvement activity in schools
2. Middle leaders have an explicit role as leaders of teaching and learning and are effectively empowered and supported
3. Middle leaders have the expertise and tools to lead constructive conversations on effectiveness of teaching and learning
4. The MAT’s leadership of teaching is informed by its core principles of learning bringing coherence and depth to the design and development of programmes and support
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **3C. Evidence based professional learning models** Culture of learningModels of professional learning Involving pupils | 1. Are MAT leaders creating and sustaining a **“culture of purposeful learning”** in every school?
2. Does the MAT have a **model for professional learning and development** that combines coaching, classroom practice and engagement in research?
3. Are teachers engaged in the right **balance between formal learning and developing their practice with their peers**?
4. Are **systems for teachers to observe and develop aspects of classroom practice together** linked to the MAT’s priorities for improvement?
5. Does the MAT have **systems for engaging and involving pupils** on how to improve teaching and learning?
 | 1. Opportunities are not intentionally provided for staff to innovate or improve their own practice through professional learning and development activities
2. The means for practice-based professional learning exist only in isolated pockets (if at all); and there is no clear model to support these approaches
3. Staff seldom engage in purposeful inquiry with their peers
4. The focus of any practice based learning is ad-hoc and not related to the MAT’s priorities
5. There are few opportunities to engage with pupils’ experience of teaching and learning or use pupil voice to improve teaching and learning across the MAT
 | 1. MAT leaders foster a culture of learning in which staff can develop their practice and test the impact of their practice through structured reflection
2. The MAT has developed the infrastructure and networks to support shared professional learning and development – e.g. through subject networks, peer-to-peer coaching and observations and reflections on classroom practice linked to the MAT’s priorities
3. Staff gain confidence through purposeful models of observation, development of practice and exposure to outstanding practice, and can say how this has helped them improve
4. Practice-based learning and research are focused on areas likely to make the biggest impact on the MAT’s priorities
5. There are strong systems in place for engaging and involving pupils and using this information to improve teaching and learning
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **4. Curriculum and assessment** |
| **4A. Curriculum structure and alignment**Age-related expectationsCurriculum designCurriculum resources | 1. **Are there common age-related expectations** for each year group across the MAT? (e.g. do all staff agree on what represents a year’s worth of progress?)
2. **Is curriculum content and design informed by the age-related expectations** and the principles that underpin the MAT’s vision?
3. Is the MAT’s approach to **prescribing/delegating elements of the curriculum** well understood?
4. **Is the curriculum regularly reviewed** for quality, consistency and breadth?
5. **Has the curriculum remained stable enough** to promote effective teaching and learning?
6. Does the MAT **expect and facilitate shared lesson planning** and the development of shared schemes of work and resources?
 | 1. Different staff may have different expectations, and limited opportunities to benchmark, pupil progress; as a result there are no consistent expectations as to what constitutes year-on-year progress across the MAT
2. The MAT’s vision and common expectations have not informed the creation/selection of a shared approach to curriculum, based on evidence
3. Staff don’t understand why the curriculum is as it is or how much discretion they have within it
4. There are few opportunities to review the effectiveness of the curriculum for all pupils
5. Curriculum has evolved/been tweaked too frequently and in an unevidenced way; pupils lack continuity year-to year
6. The MAT does not facilitate the development and dissemination of shared curriculum and lesson resources and as a result efforts are duplicated across the MAT
 | 1. Staff across the MAT have shared expectations of pupil progress; these are regularly benchmarked within the MAT and externally against others
2. Everyone in the MAT has a consistent answer to the question: “what do we want pupils to know and achieve?”; this is consistent with the MATs vision and informs a disciplined and evidence based approach to curriculum development across the MAT
3. Staff understand which elements of the curriculum are common across the MAT, and where they have discretion to innovate, and why
4. MAT leaders regularly review the curriculum from the perspective of pupils to ensure consistency, stretch, progress and breadth
5. Consistency of curriculum over time provides continuity for pupils’ learning and promotes effective transitions (e.g. when moving primary to secondary)
6. Staff are expected and supported by the MAT to develop and access shared resources that meet the needs of all their pupils, and evaluate their effectiveness
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **4B. Intentional use of assessment**MAT approach to assessment Assessment toolsModeration | 1. Is the MAT clear about the **purposes of the different types of assessment** and how they inform conversations about progress in relation to the agreed age-related expectations?
2. Do staff/schools across the MAT follow a **broadly consistent approach to assessment** based on shared training and peer review?
3. Does the MAT operate **common assessment cycles** across its schools?
4. Does the MAT systematically review and **share the impact of different assessment tools** and approaches used by schools?
5. Does the MAT have systems in place for **shared moderation**?
 | 1. The rationale underpinning the MAT’s approach to assessment is underdeveloped or not widely understood
2. An inconsistent approach to assessment makes comparisons across the MAT difficult
3. Assessment cycles are not aligned, the variation between schools means that data on progress is available at different times and therefore hinders meaningful comparison or moderation
4. The impact of different assessment tools is not shared, or is not considered at all
5. There are few opportunities and no systems for shared moderation of assessments
 | 1. The purpose of both formative and summative assessment is understood across the MAT, and aligned to the vison, curriculum and age-related expectations
2. A clear policy is being followed on the regularity and consistency of assessment; this is reinforced by shared training and peer review
3. Assessment cycles are common across all schools in the MAT, allowing a common picture of progress and comparisons between schools
4. MAT leaders ensure that the impact of all assessment tools in use is systematically reviewed, and that the results are shared widely, and used to inform future decisions
5. Shared moderation of assessments is routine and underpins the MATs expectations of what constitutes strong progress
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **5. Quality assurance and accountability** |
| **5A. Knowing schools quantitatively**Use of data across the MATGranularity of dataPerformance conversations | 1. Does the MAT have a well developed approach to the **use of data and Key Performance Indicators** which is embedded as routine in all schools?
2. **Have the MAT’s data cycles been carefully structured** to ensure that information is collected in a timely enough manner to enable effective quality assurance and intervention?
3. **Is performance information shared openly across the MAT**? Are conversations between MAT and school leaders open and effective?
4. **Do MAT leaders have an integrated picture of performance**, pulling together data on progress, attainment, wellbeing, exclusions and other key metrics/qualitative information?
5. Does the MAT regularly **evaluate the impact of teachers’ professional learning** on outcomes?
6. Does the MAT have the data to know and understand the strengths and weaknesses of **different subjects and pupil groups within its schools**?
7. **Does the MAT benchmark its performance** and progress with other similar MATs/schools?
8. **Does the MAT operate smart data systems** – i.e. having been inputted once, can the data be aggregated, disaggregated and analysis for different schools/groups of students?
9. Is overview performance data presented in a way that **empowers the MAT board and local governing bodies to ask the right questions** about school/MAT performance, and exercise their respective accountability functions?
10. Do **performance and appraisal conversations of school and MAT leaders** reflect the progress being made and capture the future focus of improvement?
 | 1. The MAT does not have a consistent approach to capturing and reviewing the performance and progress of schools through regular reporting against KPIs?
2. Data collection cycles are not structured to enable/inform timely conversations about quality and improvement which lead to impact
3. A culture of transparency has not been established, Data is not widely shared. MAT-school conversations are infrequent, superficial and/or defensive
4. MAT leaders’ view of performance is limited to their own internal data/opinions and does not take account of the full range of information available
5. The data isn’t sufficiently granular to allow subject and pupil group differences to be adequately explored
6. The MAT does not systematically review or sample teachers’ view of professional learning or their impact on outcomes or does not use any review regularly in self evaluation
7. Any benchmarking is broad-brush and only with schools’ local/traditional competitors
8. Data collection/analysis is cumbersome and involves duplication of effort; schools are often asked for the same information multiple times
9. Data provided to governance boards/trustees is too high-level, too detailed or otherwise too opaque to enable intelligent questioning and accountability
10. Performance conversations focus on compliance, process and assigning blame
 | 1. The MAT has a well thought out Data and Insights strategy that allows MAT and school leaders to routinely review performance against its KPIs
2. MAT and school leaders and staff have access to data when they need it during the year
3. Data is shared widely across the MAT and informs regular, honest, action-focused conversations with schools
4. At all levels (classroom, subject, phase and school) there is effective use of the full range of available data to identify issues regarding progress and to target interventions effectively
5. Data gives a rich picture of subject level and pupil group differences in performance allowing these questions to be explored across the MAT
6. The MAT has a regular model of evaluation which samples/ surveys school staff on the impact of professional learning on student outcomes which is shared and used in review
7. Performance and progress for each school and the MAT as a whole is specifically benchmarked against schools/MATs with similar characteristics regionally and (if appropriate) nationally
8. A single MIS system is used effectively across the MAT to allow easy analysis of data by school or student group
9. Boards/trustees receive clear, focused overviews of performance data, which they are able to explore and use to frame probing questions
10. Performance conversations focus on improvement and development and are informed by evidence
 | **R AR AG G** |
| **5B. Knowing schools well qualitatively** Reviewing progressParent/pupil feedbackPeer Review | 1. **Do MAT and cluster leaders regularly meet with school leaders** to review progress and is there a clear agenda/template for the conversation so that it is replicated with consistency across all schools?
2. Are MAT and school leaders conducting **joint learning walks, book inspections and lesson observations across the schools in the MAT** in order to triangulate KPIs with the daily lived experience in schools?
3. Is the MAT systematically building in **parental and pupil feedback** into its assessment of how well schools are progressing?
4. **Is the MAT using a formal peer review model** (involving schools within and/or beyond the MAT) to help schools identify development needs?
5. Does the MAT **use peer review for governance** of LGBs and the board and/or does it facilitate learning between governance boards /trustees across the MAT?
6. Is the MAT using the **expertise of staff and middle leaders** to work on issues where the need for improvement is identified?
 | 1. The MAT has not yet developed a routine cycle of school improvement review and monitoring activities. Meetings between MAT/cluster and school leaders are infrequent, ad-hoc and unstructured
2. MAT leaders views of what is happening in schools is based purely on reported information and occasional lone visits
3. Parent and pupil feedback is not considered by MAT leaders when assessing school performance and progress
4. Schools are left alone to identify their own development needs with no outside support
5. Governance boards/trustees for different schools within the MAT rarely interact with each other
6. Staff and middle leaders are not seen as a resource for problem-solving across the MAT
 | 1. MAT/cluster and school leaders meet regularly, in step with the rhythm of the school year; their meetings systematically cover the different aspects of school performance and improvement and have a clear agenda so that everyone comes ready for a focused conversation that helps drive improvement for all
2. MAT and school leaders visit schools and classrooms together so that they develop a shared picture of their schools
3. MAT leaders employ a range of techniques to gather parent and pupil feedback; this feedback is an integral part of assessing schools’ performance and progress
4. A formal peer review model is in place, enabling school leaders to identify development needs through structured conversations with peers
5. MAT leaders ensure that governance boards/trustees have a means to engage in peer review and joint learning; this is well used and valued across the MAT
6. Staff and middle leaders are frequently deployed to solve problems across the MAT, based on their expertise
 | **R AR AG G** |

**Capturing the output from your self-assessment**

We suggest you might want to capture the outcomes from your self-assessment in a ‘heat map’ like the one shown below so that you can easily identify from your self-assessment the priority areas where most capacity building work may be needed. You can edit the boxes below to capture judgements for your MAT.

Remember that the purpose of the tool is diagnostic, not judgemental. So areas that are judged green or amber green may still have areas for improvement. Areas that you judged amber red or red however are likely to have the most important priorities where capacity needs to be built most urgently.

**Priorities for improvement**

As well as capturingthe overall scores from your self-assessment you may also find it helpful to make a note of the key issues you identified for each of the priority areas and start to identify the actions you plan to take as a MAT to address these issues. This will allow you to track your progress over time as well.

You can use the table below to capture the specific issues identified by your self-assessment and the actions you propose to take to address them. The table below has been partially completed with examples to give you a sense of the type of evidence you might have identified and captured from the self-assessment. You can add rows to the table if needed. You may also want to link the priorities/actions identified here to your School/MAT Development Plan.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area** | **What were the key issues identified?** | **What do we need to do about it as a MAT?**  | **What progress do we want to see in the next 12 months?**  |
| 1C Leading a culture of improvement | (i) Mixed views from staff about expected pupil progress they would want to see(ii) and (iii) Schools confused about their freedom to innovate and lead – waiting for direction from the central MAT too often(iv) Views from staff across the MAT were mixed about how well engaged they felt |  |  |
| 2B Recruiting, developing & retaining talent | (i) There are serious staff shortages across some schools and we don’t have a MAT strategy to address them(ii) (iii) Some staff said they were unclear about the opportunities for progression across the MAT or how to access them |  |  |
| 3B Leadership of Teaching | (i) and (ii) Leaders of teaching and learning were seen as effective but overstretched |  |  |
| 3C Evidence based professional learning | (ii) and (iii) Few opportunities for teachers across the MAT to learn from each other (v) Little pupil involvement in improvement |  |  |